DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 236 493 CG 017 043

AUTHOR McCann, C. Douglas
TITLE Processing Goals and Social Judgment.
PUB DATE May 83
NOTE 10p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association (55th, Chicago, IL, May 5-7, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cognitive Processes; Cognitive Style; *Evaluative Thinking; *Memory; Perception; *Recall (Psychology); Responses; Schemata (Cognition); *Serial Ordering; Social Cognition
IDENTIFIERS *Impression Formation

ABSTRACT

Cognitive psychologists believe that knowledge is multifaceted and that people process more than just semantic content from a stimulus array. To investigate the implications of recall and impression formation processing objectives on the representation of serial order in memory and judgment, subjects participated in two recall and impression formation studies. In the first study, subjects read an essay describing a fictional person and then were asked to reproduce the information they had read (recall) and to give their impressions of the character. In the second study, subjects read a fictional legal case involving an assault between two persons. At selected measurement intervals subjects responded to items assessing their judgments of the guilt of the parties in the case, their confidence in the judgments, the parties' responsibility, and their attitudes toward the parties. An analysis of the results provided little evidence that processing objectives affect the representation of sequential order in memory. Both studies found that the sequential order of stimulus input was maintained in the representations formed and that its manifestation in output was dependent upon output goals. Results from study two suggested that subjects retrieving sequential information under a recall objective, as compared to an impression formation objective, were more negative in their judgments. (BL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED236493

PROCESSING GOALS AND SOCIAL JUDGMENT

C. Douglas McCann
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

M.P.A., 1983

CG 017043

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Douglas McCann

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A PREMISE COMMON TO MUCH WORK IN COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY IS THAT KNOWLEDGE IS MULTI-FACETED (e.g., Underwood, 1969) AND THAT WHEN SUBJECTS ARE EXPOSED TO A STIMULUS ARRAY, MORE THAN JUST THE SEMANTIC CONTENT IS REPRESENTED. OF PARTICULAR INTEREST IN THE PRESENT RESEARCH, IS THE REPRESENTATION OF THE ORIGINAL SEQUENTIAL ORDER OF STIMULUS EVENTS AS A FUNCTION OF SUBJECTS' PROCESSING OBJECTIVES. THE PRESENT RESEARCH FOCUSES ON: A) THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE SEQUENTIAL ORDER IS PRESERVED IN MEMORY UNDER DIFFERENT PROCESSING GOALS, AND B) THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS FOR SOCIAL JUDGMENT. TO THE EXTENT THAT THE ORDER OF STIMULUS EVENTS IS RELEVANT TO THE JUDGMENTS THE INDIVIDUALS ARE ASKED TO MAKE, THESE PROCESSING OBJECTIVES, THROUGH THEIR EFFECTS ON ORDER RETENTION, MAY HAVE IMPORTANT IMPLICATIONS FOR THE NATURE OF THE JUDGMENTS. THESE ISSUES WERE EXAMINED IN A LEGAL DECISION-MAKING CONTEXT WHERE THE ORDER OF EVENT OCCURRENCE WAS RELEVANT TO THE JUDGMENTS THE SUBJECTS WERE ASKED TO MAKE.

PSYCHOLOGISTS HAVE EVIDENCED INCREASING INTEREST IN THE EFFECTS OF RECALL AND IMPRESSION PROCESSING OBJECTIVES ON SUBJECTS' REPRESENTATION OF SOCIAL INFORMATION (e.g., Hamilton, Katz, & Leirer, 1980). PREVIOUS RESEARCH IN COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY HAS FOUND THAT SUBJECTS OPERATING UNDER MEMORY SET INSTRUCTIONS TEND TO RECALL THE ITEMS, WHENEVER POSSIBLE, IN THE SEQUENTIAL ORDER IN WHICH THEY WERE PRESENTED (e.g., Mandler & Dean, 1969). THUS, SUBJECTS OPERATING UNDER A PROCESSING OBJECTIVE EMPHASIZING RECALL SHOULD TEND TO PRESERVE THE SEQUENTIAL ORDER OF THAT INPUT IN MEMORY.

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGISTS EXAMINING THE EFFECTS OF IMPRESSION FORMATION PROCESSING OBJECTIVES HAVE DEMONSTRATED THAT SUBJECTS OFTEN REORGANIZE STIMULUS INPUT IN MEMORY (e.g., Cohen, 1981). IT IS ASSUMED THAT THIS OCCURS AS A RESULT OF THE ACTIVATION OF AN IMPLICIT PERSONALITY THEORY (e.g., Schneider, 1973), A CONCEPT CURRENTLY INTERPRETED IN SCHEMA TERMS (e.g., Jeffry & Mischel, 1979). THIS SUGGESTS THAT SUBJECTS OPERATING UNDER IMPRESSION OBJECTIVES WILL BE LESS LIKELY TO PRESERVE THE ORIGINAL STIMULUS ORDER IN MEMORY.

TWO STUDIES WERE CONDUCTED TO EXAMINE THE IMPLICATIONS OF RECALL AND IMPRESSION FORMATION PROCESSING OBJECTIVES ON THE REPRESENTATION OF SERIAL ORDER IN MEMORY AND JUDGMENT.

STUDY I

THIS STUDY CONSISTS OF A REANALYSIS OF DATA REPORTED ELSEWHERE (Higgins, McCann & Fondacaro, 1982) IN ORDER TO TEST THE ABOVE HYPOTHESES. IT SERVES THE PRESENT PURPOSE BECAUSE ALL SUBJECTS READ AN ESSAY DESCRIBING A FICTIONAL PERSON AND THEN WERE ASKED TO BOTH REPRODUCE THE INFORMATION THEY HAD READ (RECALL GOAL) AND TO GIVE THEIR IMPRESSIONS OF HIM. DIFFERENT SUBJECTS RESPONDED TO THESE GOALS IN DIFFERENT ORDERS. THIS STUDY, THEN, PROVIDES A TEST OF THE EFFECTS OF OUTPUT GOALS ON THE REPRESENTATION OF SEQUENTIAL ORDER.

DESIGN AND ANALYSIS

THE EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN UTILIZED IN THIS STUDY VARIED COMMUNICATION ROLE (SPEAKER - LISTENER), EXPECTATION OF RECEIVING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (EXPECTATION - NO EXPECTATION), THE TYPE OF INFORMATION THE SUBJECTS BELIEVED THEIR COMMUNICATION PARTNER HAD (SAME - DIFFERENT), AND THE MEASUREMENT PERIOD (PREMESSAGE - POSTMESSAGE - DELAYED).

AT EACH MEASUREMENT PERIOD, SUBJECTS WERE ASKED TO BOTH RECALL THE ORIGINAL INFORMATION AND TO GIVE THEIR IMPRESSIONS OF THE STIMULUS PERSON DESCRIBED IN THAT INFORMATION. THE PRIMARY DEPENDENT MEASURE OF INTEREST IN THE PRESENT CONTEXT WAS THE RANK ORDER CORRELATION BETWEEN THE ORDER OF THE ORIGINAL STIMULUS INFORMATION AND THE ORDER OF THAT INFORMATION AS IT WAS PRESENTED IN THE RECALL AND IMPRESSION PROTOCOLS. (SINCE NONE OF THE EXPERIMENTAL MANIPULATIONS INTERACTED WITH THE COMPARISON OF RECALL AND IMPRESSION RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS, ONLY THESE MEANS ARE PRESENTED).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

THE RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS WERE ANALYSED BY MEANS OF DEPENDENT t COMPARISONS BETWEEN RECALL AND IMPRESSION ORDERS. THE RESULTS OF THESE ANALYSES (SEE TABLE 1) INDICATED THAT THE RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS OF INITIAL STIMULUS ORDER AND RECALL ORDER WERE SIGNIFICANTLY GREATER AT ALL MEASUREMENT PERIODS THAN THOSE BETWEEN INITIAL AND IMPRESSION ORDER (PREMESSAGE, $t(65) = 9.16$, $p < .001$; POST MESSAGE, $t(65) = 8.28$, $p < .001$; DELAYED, $t(28) = 4.92$, $p < .001$).

IT IS CLEAR FROM THE ABOVE RESULTS THAT RETRIEVAL GOALS CAN AFFECT THE EXTENT

TO WHICH THE OUTPUT MANIFESTS THE SEQUENTIAL ORDER OF THE ORIGINAL STIMULUS INFORMATION. IT IS ALSO IMPORTANT TO NOTE, HOWEVER, THE FLEXIBILITY IN OUTPUT THAT THESE RESULTS DEMONSTRATE. THE ORIGINAL STIMULUS ORDER OF THE INFORMATION WAS RETAINED IN RECALL OUTPUT EVEN WHEN IT WAS NOT EVIDENCED IN PREVIOUS IMPRESSION OUTPUT. IN FACT, ORDER WAS MAINTAINED AS WELL IN REPRODUCTIONS THAT FOLLOWED IMPRESSIONS AS IN REPRODUCTIONS THAT PRECEDED IMPRESSIONS.

TABLE I

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN PRODUCTION ORDER AND INPUT ORDER

PRODUCTION STAGE	IMPRESSIONS AND ORIGINAL ORDER	REPRODUCTIONS AND ORIGINAL ORDER
OVERALL CORRELATION	.25 (n= 66)	.85 (n= 66)
PREMESSAGE AND INPUT	.21 (n= 66)	.87 (n= 66)
POSTMESSAGE AND INPUT	.30 (n= 66)	.86 (n= 66)
DELAYED AND INPUT	.36 (n= 29)	.86 (n= 29)

STUDY 2

INTRODUCTION AND DESIGN

THE RESULTS OF STUDY I INDICATED THAT ALTHOUGH PROCESSING OBJECTIVES DO INFLUENCE THE REPRESENTATION OF INITIAL INPUT ORDER THAT SUBJECTS EVIDENCE A FLEXIBILITY IN THE FORM THEIR RESPONSES TAKE. THESE RESULTS INDICATE THAT WE CANNOT NECESSARILY ASSUME THAT A REPRESENTATION OF SEQUENTIAL ORDER EVIDENT IN OUTPUT REFLECTS THE NATURE OR LIMITS OF THE STORED REPRESENTATION. STUDY I, HOWEVER, INCORPORATED ONLY RETRIEVAL GOALSAND IT MIGHT BE ARGUED THAT ENCODING GOALS MAY LIMIT THE NATURE OF THE REPRESENTATIONS THAT INDIVIDUALS STORE IN MEMORY. STUDY 2 WAS DESIGNED TO ASSESS THIS POSSIBILITY.

STUDY 2 INCORPORATED INPUT GOAL (RECALL, IMPRESSION AND NO-GOAL CONTROL) AND OUTPUT GOAL MANIPULATIONS (RECALL OR IMPRESSION GOALS) AS BETWEEN SUBJECTS FACTORS. IN ADDITION, AN OUTPUT GOAL REVERSAL MANIPULATION WAS INCLUDED AS A REPEATED MEASURES FACTOR. THIS LATTER MANIPULATION INVOLVED ASKING SUBJECTS TO REVERSE THEIR OUTPUT TASK (e.g., GIVE THEIR IMPRESSIONS OF THE TARGET PERSON AT THE SECOND MEASUREMENT INTERVAL IF THEY HAD BEEN ASKED TO RECALL THE INFORMATION AT THE FIRST MEASUREMENT INTERVAL) IN ORDER TO EXAMINE THE GOAL DEPENDENT FLEXIBILITY OF THE ORDER OF ITEMS IN SUBJECTS' OUTPUT. IN ORDER TO EXAMINE THE EFFECTS OF ORDER REPRESENTATION ON SOCIAL JUDGMENT SUBJECTS WERE ASKED TO RESPOND TO TEN 11 POINT JUDGMENT SCALES.

METHOD

STIMULUS MATERIALS. THE STIMULUS MATERIALS WERE ADAPTED FROM THE FACTS IN A FICTIONAL CASE DEVELOPED BY THIBAUT AND WALKER (1975). THE CASE INVOLVED AN ASSAULT BETWEEN TWO PERSONS, ADAMS AND ZEMP, IN WHICH THE ORDER OF EVENT OCCURRENCE WAS CRITICAL IN THE ASSIGNMENT OF GUILT. AT EACH MEASUREMENT INTERVAL SUBJECTS WERE ASKED TO RESPOND TO ITEMS ASSESSING THEIR JUDGMENTS OF: ADAMS' AND ZEMP's GUILT, THEIR CONFIDENCE IN THOSE TWO JUDGMENTS, ADAMS' AND ZEMP'S RESPONSIBILITY, THEIR CONFIDENCE IN THOSE TWO JUDGMENTS, AND THEIR ATTITUDES TOWARD BOTH ADAMS AND ZEMP. THE DEPENDENT MEASURES ALSO INCLUDED THE RANK ORDER CORRELATION OF INITIAL INPUT WITH THE ORDER OF ITEMS CONTAINED IN SUBJECTS' IMPRESSIONS AND RECALL.

UPON ENTERING THE EXPERIMENTAL ROOMS, SUBJECTS WERE GIVEN THEIR INPUT GOAL AND WERE THEN ALLOWED TO READ THE STIMULUS MATERIALS FOR ABOUT FIVE MINUTES. AFTER A BRIEF DELAY PERIOD, THEY WERE THEN GIVEN AN OUTPUT GOAL AND CONCOMITANT TASK AND THEN WERE ASKED TO RESPOND TO THE RESPONSE SCALES DESCRIBED ABOVE. FOLLOWING A 20 MINUTE DELAY PERIOD, THEY WERE GIVEN THE OTHER OUTPUT GOAL AND TASK AND WERE THEN AGAIN ASKED TO RESPOND TO THE TEN JUDGMENT SCALES.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

THE DEPENDENT MEASURES WERE ENTERED INTO A 3(INPUT GOAL) X 2(OUTPUT GOAL) X 2(GOAL REVERSAL - REPEATED MEASURE) MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE, WITH SUBSEQUENT UNIVARIATE ANALYSES CONDUCTED IN ORDER TO CLARIFY THE INTERPRETATION OF THE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS. FOLLOWING HUMEL & SLOGO (1971), HOWEVER, A REJECTION OF THE NULL HYPOTHESIS AT THE UNIVARIATE LEVEL WAS ALLOWED ONLY IF THE CORRESPONDING MULTIVARIATE EFFECT HAD REACHED SIGNIFICANCE.

SEQUENTIAL ORDER EFFECTS. THE ONLY EFFECT TO REACH AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WAS THE OUTPUT GOAL X REPEATED MEASURES INTERACTION, F (1, 54)= 229.55, $p<.0001$. THIS ANALYSIS INDICATED THAT AS THE OUTPUT GOAL WAS CHANGED TO RECALL (M= .97) FROM IMPRESSION (M= .49) THE MEAN RANK ORDER CORRELATION INCREASED, WHEREAS THE OPPOSITE PATTERN EMERGED WHEN THE OUTPUT GOAL WAS CHANGED FROM RECALL (M= .98) TO IMPRESSION (M= .46). THIS FINDING REPLICATED THE RESULT OF STUDY I IN SHOWING THAT THE RELATIONSHIP OF INPUT ORDER TO OUTPUT ORDER IS DEPENDENT UPON THE TASK AND GOALS SUBJECTS ARE ENGAGED IN. INPUT ORDER APPEARS TO BE FULLY REPRESENTED IN MEMORY BUT IS RELEVANT ONLY TO RECALL AND NOT TO IMPRESSION OBJECTIVES.

SOCIAL JUDGMENT. ANALYSIS OF THE SOCIAL JUDGMENTS SUBJECTS WERE CALLED UPON TO MAKE REVEALED SEVERAL UNIVARIATE EFFECTS CORRESPONDING TO THE SIGNIFICANT MULTIVARIATE EFFECT OF OUTPUT GOAL. THESE ANALYSES REVEALED THAT SUBJECTS: ATTRIBUTED MORE RESPONSIBILITY TO ADAMS WHEN RECEIVING THE RECALL (M= .28) RATHER THAN THE IMPRESSION OUTPUT GOAL FIRST (M = -.83), $F(1,54)$= 3.23, $p<.08$; HAD MORE CONFIDENCE IN THEIR JUDGMENTS OF ADAMS' RESPONSIBILITY WHEN RECEIVING THE RECALL GOAL (M= 3.22) RATHER

THAN THE IMPRESSION GOAL FIRST (M= 2.32), $F(1,54)$= 4.27, $p<.04$; FOUND ZEMP TO BE MORE GUILTY WHEN RECEIVING THE RECALL GOAL FIRST (M's = 3.55 & 2.68), $F(1,54)$ = 4.88, $p<.03$; FOUND ZEMP TO BE MORE RESPONSIBLE WHEN THEY RECEIVED THE RECALL GOAL FIRST RATHER THAN THE IMPRESSION GOAL (M's = 3.18 & 2.17), $F(1,54)$ = 8.07, $p<.006$; AND HAD MORE CONFIDENCE IN THOSE JUDGMENTS WHEN RECEIVING THE RECALL GOAL RATHER THAN THE IMPRESSION GOAL FIRST (M's = 3.37 & 2.38), $F(1,54)$ = 4.73, $p<.03$. THESE RESULTS SUGGEST THAT RECEIVING AN IMPRESSION FORMATION TASK FIRST LEADS TO Less SEVERE JUDGMENTS THAN RECEIVING A RECALL GOAL FIRST. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE, HOWEVER, TO SUGGEST THAT TH[E] SOCIAL JUDGMENT EFFECTS WERE DEPENDENT UPON SUBJECTS REPRESENTATION OF SEQUENTIAL ORDER IN OUTPUT.

CONCLUSIONS

1). THE REPRESENTATION OF SEQUENTIAL ORDER IN MEMORY. IT IS CLEAR THAT THE RESULTS PROVIDE LITTLE EVIDENCE THAT PROCESSING OBJECTIVES AFFECT THE REPRESENTATION OF SEQUENTIAL ORDER IN MEMORY. THE RESULTS OF BOTH STUDIES SUGGEST THAT THE SEQUENTIAL ORDER OF STIMULUS INPUT WAS MAINTAINED IN THE REPRESENTATIONS FORMED OF INDIVIDUALS OPERATING UNDER BOTH PROCESSING OBJECTIVES AND THAT ITS MANIFESTATION IN OUTPUT IS DEPENDENT UPON OUTPUT GOALS.

THESE RESULTS SUGGEST THE GOAL-DEPENDENT FLEXIBILITY OF THE FORM OF SUBJECTS' OUTPUT. OTHER SIMILAR RESEARCH HAS LARGELY INDUCED PROCESSING OBJECTIVES THROUGH INPUT INSTRUCTIONS (HAMILTON, ET AL, 1980; OSTROM, PRYOR AND SIMPSON, 1981). THE RESULTS OF THE PRESENT RESEARCH SUGGEST THAT THE ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTS OBTAINED IN THIS PREVIOUS RESEARCH MIGHT BE DUE TO PROCESSES OPERATIVE AT THE RETRIEVAL STAGE OF INFORMATION PROCESSING AND THAT THEY MIGHT BE LESS DIAGNOSTIC THAN IS ASSUMED OF THE WAY IN WHICH THAT INFORMATION IS REPRESENTED IN MEMORY.

2). SOCIAL JUDGMENT EFFECTS. THE RESULTS OF STUDY 2 SUGGEST THAT SUBJECTS RETRIEVING SOCIAL INFORMATION UNDER A RECALL OBJECTIVE, AS COMPARED TO AN IMPRESSION FORMATION OBJECTIVE, ARE MORE NEGATIVE IN THEIR JUDGMENTS. IT IS COMMONLY ASSUMED THAT AN IMPRESSION SET LEADS TO MORE INFERENTIAL ACTIVITY THAN A RECALL SET (e.g., COHEN, 1981; SPIRO, 1977). IN THE PRESENT CONTEXT, IT IS LIKELY THAT THIS INCREASED INFERENTIAL ACTIVITY COULD HAVE LED THE IMPRESSION SET SUBJECTS TO DEVELOP A REPRESENTATION OF THE STIMULUS EVENTS THAT INCLUDED ADDITIONAL INFORMATION. THIS ADDITIONAL INFORMATION MAY HAVE BEEN UTILIZED TO 'EXPLAIN' THE PARTICIPANTS' BEHAVIOR, THUS RESULTING IN JUDGMENTS THAT WERE LESS SEVERE THAN THOSE OF THE RECALL SET SUBJECTS. THE PRESENT EXAMINATION OF THE JUDGMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF PROCESSING OBJECTIVES IS QUITE DISTINCT FROM THAT OF PAST RESEARCH WHICH HAS TENDED TO FOCUS ALMOST EXCLUSIVELY ON ORGANIZATIONAL AND ITEM RECALL EFFECTS. THIS WOULD APPEAR TO BE AN IMPORTANT DIRECTION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH IN THIS AREA.

References

Cohen, C.E. Goals and schemata in person perception: Making sense from the stream of behavior. In N. Cantor & J.F. Kihlstrom (Eds.), Personality, cognition & social interaction. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1981.

Hamilton, D.L., Katz, L.B., & Leirer, V.O. Organizational processes in impression formation. In R. Hastie, et al (Eds.), Person memory: The cognitive basis of social perception. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1980.

Higgins, E.T., McCann, C.D., & Fondacaro, R. The "communication-game": Goal-directed encoding and cognitive consequences. Social Cognition, 1982, 1, 21-37.

Hummel, T.J., & Sligo, J.R. Empirical comparison of univariate and multivariate analysis of variance procedures. Psychological Bulletin, 1971, 76, 49-57.

Jeffrey, K.M., & Mischel, W. Effects of purpose on the organization and recall of information in person perception. Journal of Personality, 1979, 47, 397-419.

Mandler, G., & Dean, P. Seriation: Development of serial order in recall. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1969, 81, 207-15.

Ostrom, T.M., Pryor, J.B., & Simpson, D.D. The organization of social information. In E.T. Higgins, C.P. Herman, & M.P. Zanna (Eds.), Social cognition: The Ontario symposium, Vol. 1. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1981.

Schneider, D.J. Implicit personality theory: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 79, 249-309.

Spiro, R.J. Remembering information from text: The 'state of schemas' approach. In R.C. Anderson, R.J. Spiro, & W.E. Montague (eds). Schooling and the acquisition of knowledge. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1977.

Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. Procedural Justice: A psychological analysis. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1975.

Underwood, B.J. Attributes of memory. Psychological Review, 1969, 76, 559-573.